arXiv:1703.06013v3 [physics.gen-ph] 23 Mar 2017

Cosmology from conservation of energy

Herman Telkamp*

Abstract

It is argued that many of the problems and ambiguities of standard cosmology derive from a single one: violation of the conservation of energy in the standard paradigm. From a Machian expression of the energy between two particles, due to Schrödinger, one can derive a Machian energy equation of the expanding Universe [1], which in fact is the Friedmann equation. It turns out that conservation of total Machian energy has some intriguing consequences. It yields a set of only four admissible spacetimes (de Sitter, $k = -1, 0, 1$, and Minkowski). This, however, in the assumed presence of matter (dust, radiation,..). Subject to conservation of energy, matter appears as curvature energy, and total energy as vacuum energy. Of these models, the open de Sitter model ($\rho \propto 1 + a^{-2}$) is observationally closest to ΛCDM.

Homogeneity and isotropy of the cosmic matter distribution make the Universe at larger scales completely uniform. Why then is it so hard for us to understand the expansion dynamics of this simple distribution? After all, one expects the equations governing this expansion to be comparably simple. This is a puzzling question. The ΛCDM model is fairly simple and is observationally favorable, but is physically not understood (a.o., the well known horizon problem, coincidence problem, flatness problem, the unidentified dark matter and vacuum energy). One may add - and this is less recognized - that there are several ambiguities and fundamental problems in the concepts and assumptions underlying standard cosmology, as addressed hereafter. So the basic question, which equations govern the dynamics of an infinite homogeneous isotropic matter distribution, seems far from resolved.

Different from other physical domains, cosmology is self-referential; it lacks an independent external frame of reference. Observers themselves are subject to the very same equations, which complicates physical interpretation, or perhaps even makes us blind to underlying physics. Nevertheless, general covariance still permits us to check for the consistency of the cosmology with physical laws, such as conservation of energy. On the other hand, we may be carrying over certain standard assumptions from local physics into our models, while these are possibly invalid in the domain of cosmology, thus causing apparent violation of these laws. This may apply for instance to the assumed dilution rates of cosmic fluids, e.g., $\rho_{dust} \propto a^{-3}$ and $\rho_{radiation} \propto a^{-4}$, where $a(t)$ is the scale factor. Of course, the extra factor a for radiation is to account for redshift due to expansion of space. Yet, any difference in dilution rates not only sacrifices conservation of energy in the standard

*herman_telkamp@hotmail.com

paradigm, it also violates the equivalence of different forms of mass-energy, notably one of the cornerstones of relativity theory (at least in the strict interpretation due to Eddington, where the different forms are in fact all of the same "stuff", but just measured differently). Should we give more credit to the assumed dilution rates than to two of the most fundamental principles of physics? Then, there is the question of coordinates being physical or not. Cosmological time is commonly assumed to represent physical (clock) time of a comoving observer. Not only at present, but through all era of the universe. The implicit assumption is the absence of gravitational time dilation (the lapse function in the FLRW-metric being set to $g_{tt} = 1$). But is this assumption justified? Then there are a number of ambiguous concepts involved, like the unclear source of curvature energy, the coexistence of different causal horizons, seemingly incompatible forms of redshift, and the connected question whether recession is motion or expansion of space, or some of both. Finally, the ontological Machian principle, being as good as irrefutable, is not satisfied in standard relativistic cosmology.

One may not subscribe to all of these concerns. But at least "we don't know for sure" seems a fair position in all of them. This means we may have to let go of at least one of our standard assumptions and adopt alternatives in order to resolve the above complex of questions. It is clear that resolution of even a single one of these issues would have significant impact. But actually, the purpose here is to show that the mentioned issues are all connected and could share the same solution, that is: restoring conservation of energy.

Since FLRW spacetimes are non-stationary, it is often argued that energy can not be conserved in the expanding Universe. One may however challenge this position, since, as Florides showed long ago [2], there are exactly six FLRW spacetimes which have a static representation, i.e., Minkowski, Milne, de Sitter ($k = -1, 0, 1$), and anti-de Sitter. The common Friedmann form of these spacetimes is given by Florides as

$$\dot{a}^2 = k + Ka^2. \tag{1}$$

Of these spacetimes, the flat de Sitter universe is cosmologically highly relevant in the early (inflating) and late universe, and total vacuum energy within the de Sitter event horizon is indeed conserved. So conservation of global energy is not totally alien to cosmology. If indeed energy is conserved globally, then we may have to reconsider our basic concept of the energy associated with a particle.

From a Machian perspective (and this is a fundamental difference with both Newtonian physics and GR), energy is a relational property *between* particles, therefore not an intrinsic property of a particle. This means that each particle shares energy with every other causally connected particle. Actually, Newtonian potential energy $V_{ij} \propto m_i m_j / R_{ij}$ is perfectly Machian. Here we allow the Newtonian potential to include all forms of matter-energy. Newtonian kinetic energy, on the other hand, is defined relative to a frame of reference, therefore is not relational. Schrï¿œdinger [3] reproduced Einstein's GR expression of the anomalous perihelion precession from a Machian expression of the kinetic energy between two particles, $T_{ij} \propto V_{ij} \dot{R}_{ij}^2$. Adopting this elementary definition, one can derive the total Machian kinetic energy T between a (unit) test particle at rest in the Hubble flow and all receding

matter-energy within the gravitational horizon of the particle, yielding the Machian energy equation [1]

$$T = \frac{3}{4} r_g^2 \dot{a}^2 = 2\pi G(\rho_E + \rho_m + \rho_k) a^2 r_g^2 = E - V, \tag{2}$$

where r_g is the comoving area coordinate of the horizon, ρ_m is the combined density of the various matter sources (dust, radiation,..), $\rho_k \propto a^{-2}$ is curvature energy density, and V combines potential energies of matter and curvature. Conserved total energy E is expressed by the density

$$\rho_E = \frac{E}{2\pi G a^2 r_g^2}. \tag{3}$$

Note that Eq.(2) is in fact the Friedmann equation, multiplied on both sides by the common factor r_g^2. The presence of total energy density ρ_E may seem deviant from relativistic cosmology. But, as is clear from Eq.(3), in the case of the de Sitter universe, where $R_g \equiv a r_g$ is constant, ρ_E is constant too. Thus, total energy density ρ_E provides a simple and natural explanation of constant vacuum energy density ρ_Λ. This interpretation, however, does not hold with other spacetimes, since R_g is constant uniquely in de Sitter. Yet, we will argue that the de Sitter universe is underlying all era of the Universe, so that indeed $\rho_E = \rho_\Lambda$.

Eq.(2) shows that all energy terms associated with the test particle depend on the evolving comoving distance $r_g(a)$ to the horizon, and so on the changing number of connected particles. In light of this, it is conceivable that energy density not necessarily dilutes as a^{-3} in order for energy to be conserved. If dilution rates are different for different forms of matter, then there is no way that the energy associated with each fluid can be conserved independently by adaptation of the single common horizon. Hence, maintaining (strict) mass-energy equivalence means that all matter densities must dilute at the same rate. So, at what rate? For instance, one may view massive particles as wave phenomena, which suggests that all matter dilutes equally, as a^{-4}. The zero-field of the universe, however, rather suggests for dust to dilute as a^{-2}, like in coasting cosmologies (cf. Layzer [4]). The answer must lie in the solution of the horizon coordinate $r_g(a)$.

Of the three causal horizons relevant to cosmology, i.e., particle horizon, event horizon and apparent horizon, the latter has gained much interest since it has been connected with black hole thermodynamics and has a clear notion of the energy within the horizon, the Misner-Sharp mass. The quite trivial reason to identify the gravitational horizon with the apparent horizon is that in FLRW spacetimes this horizon is always nearest of the three [5]. The ambiguity here is the coexistence of multiple causal horizons at different distances (e.g., the apparent horizon and the event horizon in accelerating universes). There are however two unambiguous cases, a universe of radiation only and the de Sitter universe, where the apparent horizon coincides with the particle horizon and event horizon, respectively. In any case, we choose the gravitational horizon to be the apparent horizon, as it is always nearest and always exists. The equation of the apparent horizon coordinate is [5]

$$r_A^2 = \frac{c^2}{\dot{a}^2 + c^2\kappa}, \tag{4}$$

where $\kappa = k/r_{A0}^2$ is the Gaussian curvature, with index $k = -1, 0, 1$, for spatially open, flat and closed geometries, respectively. Given that in the general (curved) case

$$\dot{a}^2 = a^2 \frac{8}{3}\pi G(\rho_m + \rho_E) - c^2\kappa, \tag{5}$$

it is clear, and notable, that curvature energy (if any) is always removed from the denominator of Eq.(4). So we have

$$r_A^2 = \begin{cases} c^2/a^2\frac{8}{3}\pi G(\rho_m + \rho_E), & \rho_m \nsim a^{-2} \\ c^2/a^2\frac{8}{3}\pi G\rho_E, & \rho_m \sim a^{-2}. \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Then, setting $r_g = r_A$ and substituting Eqs.(5) and (6) on the left hand side of the Machian equation (2) gives the simple result

$$T = \frac{3}{4} r_g^2 \dot{a}^2 = \frac{3}{4} c^2 \left(1 - \kappa r_g^2\right) = E - V. \tag{7}$$

It seems as if matter composition of the Universe is irrelevant. But rather, matter behaves very specifically, being subject to conservation of energy, as will follow.

The horizon coordinate $r_g(a)$ can actually be identified from Eq.(7), which reduces to $r_g\dot{a} = c(1 - \kappa r_g^2)^{1/2}$. According to the FLRW-metric, the inward directed radial null geodesic at the horizon satisfies $a\dot{r}_g = -c(1 - \kappa r_g^2)^{1/2}$. Therefore,

$$\dot{R}_g = r_g\dot{a} + a\dot{r}_g = 0, \tag{8}$$

i.e., $R_g = const$, which means a de Sitter event horizon, in all era. Thus indeed, total energy density behaves as vacuum energy density. With $r_g(a) \propto a^{-1}$, Eq.(7) yields the Friedmann equation

$$\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} = H_\Lambda^2 \left(1 - \frac{k}{a^2}\right) \propto \rho_\Lambda + \rho_k, \qquad \text{where} \qquad H_\Lambda^2 = \frac{c^2}{r_{go}^2}, \tag{9}$$

which is conform Florides Eq.(1), but here only with the de Sitter variations ($k = -1, 0, 1$), and Minkowski as a limiting case of de Sitter ($H_\Lambda = 0$). The quite intriguing aspect, however, is that we have assumed the presence of matter ρ_m. This suggests that the "empty" solutions (Milne, Minkowski, de Sitter) are actually non-empty, which essentially agrees with the relational (Machian) principle that inertia, space and time emerge from the interaction of matter. In this view, totally empty space can not even exist.

The question now is how realistic the model is. Since we already have ρ_E as a source of ρ_Λ, and have not yet identified a source of ρ_k, this suggests $\rho_k = \rho_m \propto a^{-2}$ (also known as *K-matter* [6]). That is, matter and curvature energy are one and the same. With $\rho_k = \rho_m > 0$, we have $k = -1$. Together with vacuum energy $\rho_E = \rho_\Lambda$, this gives a hyperbolic de Sitter universe

$$\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} = H_\Lambda^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{a^2}\right), \qquad \text{where} \qquad H_\Lambda^2 = \frac{c^2}{r_{go}^2}. \tag{10}$$

This presents a single parameter universe (H_Λ). The model Eq.(10) has many favorable properties, and takes away most of the concerns mentioned in the introduction, as can be checked easily. It has solution $a(t) \propto sinh(H_\Lambda t)$ and yields a deceleration $q_0 = -\frac{1}{2}$ at present epoch, quite close to ΛCDM with $q_0 \sim -0,55$ (Planck [7]). This open de Sitter model has however been given little attention in cosmological literature ([8] gives a qualitative assessment of the model); unfortunately, a rigorous model comparison against observations seems lacking at this point (obviously, there seems no point in considering an "empty" model).

The peculiarity of the model Eq.(10) is of course that $\rho_m(t_0) = \rho_E = const$ at any instance t_0. So moving along with incrementing t_0 actually yields a flat de Sitter model. This may be understood as follows. Since $k = -1$, space is curved, which gives rise to gravitational time dilation, $g_{tt} = 1 + a^{-2}$. This means that physical time t' of a comoving observer is actually gravitational dilated cosmic time t. Hence, setting $k = 0$ and substituting t for t' (or alternatively, substituting $dt^2 = g_{tt}^{-1} dt'^2$) transforms away all matter, and turns the model Eq.(10) into an, apparently empty, flat de Sitter universe,

$$\frac{1}{a^2}\frac{da^2}{dt'^2} = H_\Lambda^2, \tag{11}$$

of equal simplicity as the cosmic matter distribution, indeed.

References

[1] H. Telkamp, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 043520 (2016).

[2] P. Florides, Gen Relat Gravit **12**, 563 (1980).

[3] E. Schroedinger, Annalen der Physik **382**, 325 (1925).

[4] D. Layzer, Astronomical Journal **59**, 268 (1954).

[5] V. Faraoni, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 024003 (2011).

[6] E. W. Kolb, The Astrophysical Journal **344**, 543 (1989).

[7] Planck Collaboration, P. Ade, and et al., AA **594**, A13 (2016).

[8] V. Kuzmichev and V. Kuzmichev, Ukr.J.Phys. **57**, 1169 (2012).